

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

**JAMES P. ERLANDSON, individually
and on behalf of all others similarly
situated,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**CONOCOPHILLIPS COMPANY and
BURLINGTON RESOURCES, INC.,**

Defendant.

No. 09-99-DRH

ORDER

HERNDON, Chief Judge:

Before the Court are Defendants ConocoPhillips Company and Burlington Resources, Inc.'s Motion for Additional Time to File Responsive Pleadings (Doc. 38) and Motion for Leave to File an Over-Length Memorandum (Doc. 39). Defendants first motion requests an additional four days in which to file a response to Plaintiff's motion for class certification (Doc. 33) as the persons involved in preparing the response are out-of-town. Plaintiff does not oppose the request as long as he receives an additional four days in order to file his Reply brief which Defendants have agreed too. Therefore, based on the reasons in the motion, the Court **GRANTS** Defendants' motion for additional time to file responsive pleadings. Defendants will have up to and including **January 8, 2010** in which to file their response. Further, Plaintiff will have to and including **January 22, 2010** in which to file a reply.

Defendants have also filed a motion for leave to file an over-length memorandum (Doc. 39). Defendants were initially allowed to file a 30 page memorandum in opposition to class certification. Defendants now request an additional 5 pages in order to address the complex factual and legal issues raised by Plaintiff's motion. Again, Plaintiff does not object to the motion as long as he is also allowed an additional five pages which Defendants have consented to. However, under Local Rule 7.1(d), "[r]equests for additional pages are not allowed." **S.D.I.L. LOCAL RULE 7.1(d)**. Therefore, the Court **DENIES** Defendants motion for leave to file an over-length memorandum (Doc. 39).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 30th day of December, 2009.

/s/ David R. Herndon

**Chief Judge
United States District Court**